EXHIBIT D

From:	Tim Lindholm.	Sent: 12/20/2005 10:40 AM.
To: [-]	Andy Rubin.	
Cc: [-]	Dan Bornstein.	
Bcc: [-]	.	
Subject:	Re: JCP Click-Through Licenses?.	

I agree that if you are prepared to forego an independent implementation
route then clicking through these licenses probably will not matter. I have
no basis for an opinion of whether Google could do an independent imple-
mentation, but even if we were to do one today's spec licenses do grant a
fair bit of latitude in downstream licensing.

Note that the JSR-202 draft license is eval-only, so it's only of short-
term value anyhow.

-- Tim

Andy Rubin wrote:
> My reasoning is that either a) we'll partner with Sun as contemplated
> in our recent discussions or b) we'll take a license. I think a
> clean-room implementation is unlikely because of the teams prior
> knowledge, and it would be uncharacteristically aggressive of us to
> position ourselves against the industry.
>
> The only thing we give up is a little leverage in the discussions where
> the threat of a clean-room implementation is of some value.
>
>
>
>
> On Dec 20, 2005, at 10:12 AM, Dan Bornstein wrote:
>
>> Tim,
>>
>> What's your take on the advisability of clicking through to get JSR
>> documents? I find myself wanting to get the JSR-202 draft ("Java Class
>> File Specification") as well as the final version of JSR-139
>> (CLDC-1.1). Andy seems to think it's fine, but we both agree a second
>> opinion would be good to have.
>>
>> Thanks.
>>
>> -dan
>
>

Trial Exhibit 12, Page 1 of 1